UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,036	01/08/2004	Stanley Bielak	10032	7885

7590   05/27/2009

STANLEY BEILAK
2128 BAYFRONT AVENUE TERRACE
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21409

EXAMINER
HONG, HYUN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2426	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/755,036	BIELAK, STANLEY
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hyun J. Hong	2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 February 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 8-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 8-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Regarding claims 1-3, arguments are moot in view of new grounds of

rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US

2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of

Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619).

Regarding claim 1, Huggins discloses a method for creating a

presentation

Adding placeholder slides (fig. 10),

Uploading the presentation into the remote server which is accessible to

end-users ([0023]),

However Huggins does not disclose creating user polls and quizzes on a

remote server, generating a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the

remote server; replacing each placeholder slide with at least one of a website

link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the

remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes

stored on the remote server, recording information on what the end user has

scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll.

In analogous art, Stirpe discloses creating user polls and quizzes on a

remote server ([0107] *polls and quizzes and all other relevant data go to the*

knowledge exchange of fig. 10), generating a list of available polls and quizzes

stored on the remote server ([0107, 0108]; replacing each placeholder slide with

at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and

quizzes stored on the remote server ([0107], and a quiz selected from the list of

available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server ([0107]), recording

information on what the end user has scored on a quiz ([0104]), feedback

provided by the end-user on a poll ([0118]). It would have been obvious to

combine the quiz system of Stirpe into the presentation of Huggins. This would

allow an author to ensure that the viewers have watched their presentations.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe also does not disclose taking a video

stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a

time stamp; and sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on said

display device, starting from an initial video frame of said video stream.

In analogous art, Roelens discloses taking a video stream including a

plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; and

sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on said display device, starting

from an initial video frame of said video stream ([0008,0009]). It would have been obvious to combine the video frame display of Roelens into the presentation of Huggins in view of Stirpe. This ensures that the video and audio of the presentation are synchronized.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens does not disclose recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation.

In analogous art, Joao discloses recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation ([0036,0041]). It would have been obvious to combine the monitoring of Joao into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens. This would allow an author to monitor the progress of the presentation's viewers.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao does not disclose that the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections.

In analogous art, Theall discloses that a presentation can be divided into any number of sections ([0055]). It would have been obvious to combine the sectioning of Theall into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao. This would give the author more options in creating a presentation.

Regarding claim 2, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method for playing a presentation including

polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections

([0055] of Theall) comprising:

        Receiving a presentation from a remote server ([0024] of Huggins)

        Sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream

of data ([0008, 0009] of Roelens),

        Selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a

local computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed

by the end user ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

        Pausing said stream of data when one of the frames contains placeholder

data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the remote server

([0107, 0108] of Stirpe *The presentation must be inherently paused for the users*

to be able to take the quiz).

        displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be access by an end-

user ([0107, 0108]);

        Monitoring usage of said presentation ([0036, 0041] of Joao);

        Recording information regarding each end-user's usage of said

presentation, the information including an end user's identity ([0036-0041] of

Joao) how far the end-user watched said presentation ([0036, 0041] of Joao),

what the end user has scored on a quiz ([0104] of Stirpe), feedback by the end

user on a poll ([0118] of Stirpe) and how much time the end-user spent watching

said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao) and how much elapsed time the end-

user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation ([0055] of

Theall, [0036-0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 3, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view

of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method of communicating between a

presentation program; said program being stored on a computer readable

medium executable by computer, and a remote server including interactive

media when a presentation is being viewed by a user, said method comprising

(see the rejection of claim 1):

Communicating a request for the presentation, wherein the presentation is

divided into a plurality of sections (see the rejection of claim 1);

Receiving a stream of data from the server, including placeholder data

related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by a user (see the

rejection of claim 1)

Pausing the stream of data when the placeholder data related to at least

one of a poll and a quiz is received (see the rejection of claim 2);

Retrieving the at least one poll and quiz related to the received

placeholder data from the remote server (see the rejection of claim 1);

Responding to the poll or quiz at a local computer by an end user (see the

rejection of claim 1);

Uploading the poll or quiz results to the remote server (see the rejection of

claim 1);

Monitoring usage of said presentation ([0036-0041] of Joao);

Recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation,

wherein said information includes a user's identity, how far the user watched said

presentation, what the user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the user

on a poll, and how much elapsed time the user spent viewing each of the plurality

of sections of the presentation (see the rejection of claim 1)

Wherein said presentation includes video stream including a plurality of

video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; sequentially

displaying said video frame by frame on a display device, starting from an initial

video frame of said video stream; placeholder slides corresponding to a user

polls, quizzes, or website links accessible via remote server, and wherein said

end user selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of

a local computer, content related to a poll or quiz to be accessed by the end user

(see the rejection of claim 1).

Regarding claim 6, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view

of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method of displaying a presentation

according to claim 2, wherein the polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis

([0104] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 8, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view

of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein

said information include information regarding which user watched which

particular presentation and how far the user watched said presentation and how

much time said user spent watching said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 9, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view

of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein

said information is reported and/or displayed to a user and/or presentation owner

([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 10, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis ([0104] of Stirpe)

Regarding claim 11, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation indexing a video and slides to allow a user to jump to different portions of the presentation (([0015] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 12, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation is paused for a poll or quiz when the poll or quiz is initiated by said user or required by said presentation ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 13, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation program synchronizes a video with active server pages references that point to specific polls or quizzes ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 16, see claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, see claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, see claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information further includes which end-user watched which particular presentation, and how much time the end-user spent watching the particular presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 20, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the information further includes information regarding when an end-user exits said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Claims 4, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) as applied to claim 1 above, further in Coughlin (US 2003/0034999).

Regarding claim 4, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising collecting indexing and other data from a server database and displaying said indexing and other data to a presentation's author creating indexes for users to look up presentations based on content ([0015] of Stirpe).

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall does not disclose log-on that validates authors.

In analogous art, Coughlin discloses log-on that validates authors (fig. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the validation of Coughlin into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall. This would prevent any unauthorized editing of a presentation.

Regarding claim 14, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall in view of Coughlin discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein an end user accesses said presentation by providing a valid authorization key (fig. 15 of Coughlin).

Claims 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 5, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said presentation is hosted by said remote server, and said remote server hosting presentations user tracking and monitoring ([0036-0041] of Joao)) indexing for users to look up select presentations ([0015] of Stirpe).

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall does not disclose encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing protected content.

In analogous art, Mills discloses Encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing protected content ([0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the encryption of Mills into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in

view of Joao in view of Theall. This would prevent any unauthorized access of

the presentations.

Claims 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view

of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215)

further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) further in view of Coughlin (US

2003/0034999) as applied to claim 14 above, further in view of Mills (US

2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 15, Coughlin discloses the method according to claim

14 and presentation program shutdown (fig. 41 "X" of Coughlin). However,

Coughlin not disclose presentation program shutdown if the user attempts to

access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key.

In analogous art, Mills discloses presentation program shutdown if the

user attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key

([0034] of Mills).

It would have been obvious to combine the encrypted presentation of Mills

into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in

view of Joao in view of Theall in view of Coughlin. This would prevent

unauthorized use of the presentation program.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hyun J. Hong whose telephone number is (571)270-1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30a-7:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571)272-3685. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph P. Hirl/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426
May 22, 2009

/H. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2426